R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 002 959 24

REPORT OF A RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE.

BY- SMITH, STELLA
SOUTHERN STATE COLLEGE, MAGNOLIA, ARK.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-X-002 PUB DATE 65
GRANT OEG-610001
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$2.76 69P.

DESCRIPTORS- *GUIDANCE PROGRAMS, *CONFERENCES, *EDUCATIONAL GUIDANCE, GUIDANCE, GUIDANCE COUNSELING, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, *RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, MAGNOLIA, ARKANSAS

A CONFERENCE WAS CONVENED IN ORDER TO (1) REVIEW CURRENT AND COMPLETED RESEARCH, (2) DEVELOP GUIDELINES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH, AND (3) GENERATE NEW RESEARCH IDEAS AND DEVELOP PLANS FOR STIMULATING RESEARCH RELATING TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE. THE CONFERENCE WAS HELD AT SOUTHERN STATE COLLEGE, MAGNOLIA, ARKANSAS, NOVEMBER 10-13, 1965. PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL GUIDANCE WORKERS WERE FACED WITH INTERPRETING THEIR IDEAS IN TERMS THAT WERE INTELLIGIBLE TO ANTHROPOLOGISTS, PEDIATRICIANS, SOCIAL WORKERS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EDUCATORS, PSYCHOLOGISTS, AND MANY OTHER RELATED DISCIPLINES. IN SPITE OF THE PROBLEM OF COMMUNICATION AMONG THE SEVERAL PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINES AND THE LIMITED TIME ALLOTMENT, SEVERAL SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH NEEDS WERE IDENTIFIED. WHILE THE PARTICIPANTS AGREED THAT GUIDANCE PROGRAMS WILL HAVE TO BE ADAPTED TO LOCAL NEEDS AND CONDITIONS, SOME BASIC PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES SHOULD BE RESEARCHED FOR THE PURPOSE OF FORMULATING SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE ACTIVITIES OF COUNSELORS AND DEVELOPING APPROPRIATE PERSONNEL TRAINING PROGRAMS. THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL CONFERENCES OF THIS NATURE WAS MADE APPARENT BOTH BY THE REACTION OF THE PARTICIPANTS AND THE LIST OF TOPICS SUGGESTED FOR INVESTIGATION. APPENDIXES INCLUDED THE KEYNOTE ADDRESS "GUIDANCE COUNSELING FROM THE DEVELOPMENTAL POINT OF VIEW" BY L.B. AMES AND THE GENERAL SESSION ADDRESS "RESEARCH DESIGNS--COOPERATIVE RESEARCH GRANTS NOW AVAILABLE--COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROJECTS RELATED TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE" BY R.H. BEEZER. (GC)

ED002959

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

REPORT OF

A RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE

Cooperative Research Project No. X-002

Stella Smith, Coordinator
Department of Elementary Education
Southern State College
Magnolia, Arkansas 71753

1965

The research reported herein was supported by the
Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education,
United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

CONFERENCE STAFF

Conference Coordinator
Stella Smith
Department of Elementary Education
Southern State College

Conference Secretary
Alvarene G. Peace
Department of Business and Commerce
Southern State College

CONFERENCE LEADERS

Conference Chairman
Hyrum Smith
Chief, Guidance Procedures and Techniques Section
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Conference Consultants

Louise Eckerson
Specialist, School Personnel Services
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Dolph Camp
Chief, Occupational and Career Guidance Section
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Robert H. Beezer
Research Coordinator
Cooperative Research Program
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Conference Writers

Walter M. Lifton
Coordinator, Pupil Personnel Services
Rochester City School District
Rochester, New York

Gwen A. Nelson
Assistant Superintendent in charge of Pupil Services
Wichita Public Schools
Wichita, Kansas

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Without the help and encouragement of many people, plans for this project could not have been formulated and the conference could not have materialized. It is impossible in this space to thank all who contributed, but I do want to thank:

DR. D. C. ANDREW, Academic Dean, whose wide background of experiences in the field of guidance helped assure the success of the project;

DR. HYRUM SMITH for his fine leadership as Conference Chairman and for his assistance with pre-conference planning;

DR. LOUISE ECKERSON and DR. DOLPH CAMP for making available at the conference reports and participants from various disciplines;

DR. ROBERT H. BEEZER for helping develop the plans for the conference and for providing stimulation and direction to the discussion groups;

ALVARENE G. PEACE, conference secretary, who handled the many details of the conference with gracious efficiency;

DR. WALTER M. LIFTON and DR. GWEN A. NELSON for bringing to the conference a wealth of knowledge and experience in research and for sharing in the writing of this report.

-- Stella Smith

December 15, 1965

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page i

Conference Staff iii

Acknowledgment v

Table of Contents vii

Foreword ix

Program xiii

Conference Report 1

Implications of Present Practices 5
Role and Function 8
Preparation of Personnel 11
Organization and Administration 15
Conclusion 19

Appendix I - Conference Participants 20

Appendix II - "Guidance Counseling from the Developmental Point of View" - Keynote Address by Louise Bates Ames 23

Appendix III - "Research Designs -- Cooperative Research Grants Now Available -- Cooperative Research Projects Related to Elementary School Guidance" - Address by Robert H. Beezer 44

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

FOREWORD

As a result of a growing concern about recent developments in elementary school guidance, Southern State College applied for and received a grant from the Cooperative Research Branch of the United States Office of Education to conduct a National Conference on Elementary School Guidance. The purposes of the conference were (1) to review current and completed research related to elementary school guidance, (2) to develop guidelines for future research related to elementary school guidance, and (3) to generate new research ideas and develop plans for stimulating research related to elementary school guidance.

Twenty-five authorities in the fields of school guidance, school social work, psychology, child psychiatry, anthropology, research methodology, and education were invited to participate in the conference. The program, described in the next section, provided opportunities for participants to consider specific topics needing research in small groups, and subsequent discussion of small group reports in the general session. Recorders for each group developed specific suggestions for research needed in

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

elementary school guidance. The summary of the conference reports is being submitted to the Cooperative Research Branch of the United States Office of Education for dissemination to individuals and institutions interested in developing research proposals to be considered by the Cooperative Research Branch.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

PROGRAM

National Research Conference

on

Elementary School Guidance

at

Southern State College
Magnolia, Arkansas

November 10 - 13, 1965

TO review current and completed research related to elementary school guidance;

develop guidelines for future research on elementary school guidance;

generate new research ideas and develop plans for stimulating research on elementary school guidance.

Supported by a grant from Cooperative Research Branch of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Wednesday, November 10

Registration and Coffee — 4:00 P. M.

General Session — 7:30 P. M.
Keynote Address - Louise Bates Ames
"Guidance Counseling from the Developmental Point of View"

Thursday, November 11

General Session — 8:00 A. M.
Orientation - Louise Eckerson
"Philosophies, Trends, and Present Programs in Elementary School Guidance"

Small Groups — 10:00 A. M.
Discussion - Group Chairman
Topic I - "What Research Is Needed in Defining the Purpose of Guidance Services in the Elementary School?"

Small Groups — 1:30 P. M.
Discussion - Group Chairman
Topic II - "What Research Is Needed in Determining the Guidance Services to Be Performed in the Elementary Schools?"

General Session
Moderator - Dean Andrew
Reports on Topics I and II by Group Recorders

General Session — 8:00 P. M.
Speaker - Robert H. Beezer
"Research Designs - Cooperative Research Grants Now Available - Cooperative Research Projects Related to Elementary School Guidance"

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Friday, November 12

Small Groups — 8:00 A. M.

Discussion - Group Chairman
Topic III - "What Research Is Needed to Define the Guidance Role of Elementary School Personnel and Specialists Outside the Elementary School?"

Small Groups — 10:00 A. M.

Discussion - Group Chairman
Topic IV - "What Research Is Needed to Determine Necessary Qualifications and Appropriate Training for Elementary School Guidance Worker?"

General Session — 2:00 P. M.

Moderator - Dolph Camp
Reports on Topics III and IV by Group Recorders

Small Groups — 3:00 P. M.

Discussion - Group Chairman
Topic V - "What Research Is Needed to Determine How Effective Guidance Programs Might Be Organized and Administered in the Elementary Schools?"

Small Groups — 8:00 P. M.

Discussion - Group Chairman
Topic VI - "What Research Is Needed to Suggest Methods for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Guidance Programs in the Elementary Schools?"

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Saturday, November 13

Small Groups Discussion - Group Chairman Topic VII - "Guidelines for Future Research"	8:00 A. M.
General Session Moderator - Hyrum Smith Reports on Topics V, VI, and VII by Group Recorders	9:30 A. M.
Adjournment	11:00 A. M.

CONFERENCE REPORT

One of the real strengths of this conference stemmed from the inter-disciplinary backgrounds of the participants. Professional school guidance workers were faced with interpreting their ideas in terms that were intelligible to anthropologists, pediatricians, social workers, elementary school educators, psychologists, and many other related disciplines. Within this framework, differences in value systems and underlying philosophies of participants became very clear. This condition created a dilemma for the group. Believing in the value of diversity, the group still recognized that the creation of this new role could not proceed unless some consensus was achieved about suitable purposes and values to be attained through elementary school guidance activities. A strong feeling was expressed that the additional meetings of this type should be conducted where the objective would be the establishment of guidelines which would reflect professional opinion and ultimately national policy.

To achieve this objective it was suggested that a small working committee be organized which would represent the

interests of the following organizations:

American Personnel and Guidance Association
National Vocational Guidance Association
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
American Association of School Administrators
National Education Association (Classroom Teachers Division)
United States Office of Education
American Psychological Association (Divisions 7, 12, 16, and 17)
American Psychiatric Association
Interprofessional Research Commission on Pupil Personnel Services

Such a committee would be charged to review the literature dealing with philosophical bases and goals of elementary guidance prior to the conference. To facilitate integration of prior activity by other groups concerned with elementary school guidance, the committee should be familiar with the suggestions of the conference at Southern State College, Magnolia, Arkansas; the report written by the American School Counselors Association and the Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors Committee on Elementary Guidance; and the findings of Interprofessional Research Commission on Pupil Personnel Services. Because the role of the elementary school counselor in an inter-disciplinary approach is demanding, the emerging statement of goals and philosophies developed by this committee should be widely disseminated not only to the organizations listed previously, but also to professional groups representing

the disciplines which will be called upon in the preparation of elementary school counselors.

Although the group permitted itself to brainstorm and dream about idealistic conditions, it fully recognized that a bridge needs to be built between today and tomorrow. Accordingly, they felt that priority in research planning should be assigned to an exploration of what the situation currently is, what important segments of our community conceive as their role, and what activities are being left unplanned or inadequately manned. Equally apparent to the group was the need for early development of suitable instruments which would be required to evaluate some of the specific issues needing investigation.

This is the report of a group of people concerned about elementary school guidance, searching for issues that need to be clarified, unwilling to accept any pet idea unless it can stand up under testing, and humble in its awareness that no one report achieved in such a brief period of time can hope to be as comprehensive as the topic deserves. Although some of the areas requiring research are now being investigated, the topics are still included since others might like to attack these areas in a different way. All participants in the conference were painfully aware that

they might have overlooked issues of greater importance than those being discussed. The report is admittedly limited in its scope, but it is hoped that it will serve as a springboard for others seeking ideas that are deserving of research.

Implications of Present Practices

It was fully accepted that many programs have existed and are now in operation which contain characteristics worthy of continuation. Obviously the movement of any profession depends on at least two check points, where the professional group now is, and their ultimate goal. Using a questionnaire addressed to all people concerned with facilitating the child's adjustment to, and his use of, his school environment, the following types of data need to be collected:

1. Which of the following activities are you doing now?

2. In an ideal situation which of the following activities do you feel you would like to do, i.e., if you had the time, skills and understandings, and facilities? Rank these activities in order of the importance you ascribe to them. Why do you think they are important?

3. Identify factors preventing you from performing ideal functions.

4. Which of these activities do you believe is not part of your job and should be done by others?

5. Make provisions for collecting pertinent data on factors influencing response.

The resulting data will demonstrate areas of operation shared by several people, differences in perception over goal and function,

and areas requiring expansion of service. Each of the areas where discrepancies occur between assignments of role, techniques to be employed, or actual versus idealized behavior is amenable to experimental testing to discover the preferred use of staff, more efficient techniques, and the gaps in training of personnel which become evident. The differences in perception also document current breakdowns in communication between those individuals concerned about the child's growth and development in school. Specific studies need to be designed to locate causes of communication breakdown and to check alternate techniques for repairing the flow of ideas. Although the major focus of this conference was on the role of the elementary school counselor, it was recognized that some needs of children are not now being adequately met in the school setting. This concern was reflected in such questions as:

1. If the school continues to become more decentralized and impersonal, which person ought to be designated to meet the dependency needs of children?
2. Many children have handicaps which are not remediable. How can we assist the child and the school to enable the child to develop realistic and rewarding goals despite his limitations?
3. Many studies should be made to test the theories concerning physical, emotional, and intellectual deprivation. The Head Start Program has made these studies imperative. The results of studies should be translated into terms that teachers and parents understand.

The group placed considerable importance on the need to check the theory, currently popular, that deficits in emotional and intellectual stimulation are remediable using existing educational techniques. To set up studies designed to answer these questions, prior developmental research is needed to develop tools which will permit differential diagnoses so that remedial techniques are really applied in the area of deficit.

Since there is some evidence that deprivation of stimuli at certain critical periods in a child's growth may cause irreparable damage, research is needed which might incorporate the concepts of Piaget and Montessori to determine if critical stages do exist, when they occur, and their implications for the future growth of the child.

Much of the needed research just described requires careful attention to the effects on results arising from different child-rearing practices which reflect the values of different ethnic groups. Cross cultural studies may permit the elementary school counselor to know how best to help the child and educational workers build on the strengths which are part of a sub-group culture, and also to assist curriculum workers to incorporate the values of differing groups in our society.

Role and Function

Although some confusion exists over where the teacher's role ends and the role of ancilliary workers begin, there are several areas seen as appropriate to the elementary school counselor and/or psychologist or social worker. When the teaching function is separated out, schools still want help and answers to the following questions:

1. What techniques are most effective in the early identification of the under-achiever?

2. Are different remedial techniques necessary to overcome under-achievement due to differences in age, cultural background, sex, or other significant variables?

3. What are the relative merits of group guidance, small group counseling, and individual counseling when tested as remedial techniques for specific problems about which educators worry?

4. Since the elementary school counselor is seen as a specialist in the psychology of learning, what should his role be in curriculum revision, selection of new educational media, or in the retraining of staff?

5. What approaches are most consistent with the objectives of elementary school counseling as applied to the counselors involvement in discipline problems?

6. How many contacts can counselors have with individual child? How can conflict situations be identified?

7. What is the role of the elementary counselor in dealing with conflict situations? How can counselors help resolve conflicts?

8. What inter-staff conflicts are created by elementary school counselors? To what extent can school systems or children profit by these conflicts?

9. Based upon the many demands being made on the elementary school counselor, which tools and techniques (play therapy, diagnostic testing, etc.) must be part of his repertoire? How can we decide which is the best tool for a specific function? How can we assess the counselor's proficiency in the use of these techniques?

10. Since the appropriate placement of children may be one of the functions of the elementary school counselor, research is needed to provide them with information about criteria to be used in screening children for entry into school or for special class placement.

11. With the acceptance of the importance of early childhood experiences upon school success, the responsibility of the elementary school counselor for assisting in pre-school programs needs to be explored. Since this may be the school's first contact with the child, research is needed on the types of early screening procedures that are desirable, type of records which prove most useful as the basis for starting a cumulative record, and the type of work with parents needed to insure both an understanding of the parents' role and the school's mission.

12. Since children learn by emulating adults, what research is needed on the inclusion of role models in the school setting?

13. Since it is assumed that different children learn at different speeds and in different ways, research is needed to assist the counselor to insure the proper learning environment in the school for each child.

14. Since the range of jobs being assigned to a counselor is monumental, what size case load of students is realistically possible for him to carry and do an effective job?

15. In order to use community resources most effectively beyond the school and to insure cooperation of involved agencies, there is need for a clearing house in each school. Research is needed to determine which staff member can best complete this synthesizing function.

The above listing of possible roles and functions is far from complete. In attempting to secure answers to each of these questions, it is anticipated that the unique characteristics of each school and staff will determine the results. If, following replication of these studies across the nation, a common trend develops, only then can it be considered as a vital characteristic useful in the screening of personnel for training.

Preparation of Personnel

It is evident that the graduate programs for the preparation of the guidance worker must be predicated upon specific job descriptions. To meet the needs of elementary school pupils, and to be founded upon sound psychological bases, these job descriptions must be developed cooperatively. Representatives of training institutions, public school systems, and related agencies will have to arrive at reasonable agreement both upon the job to be done and the training required to perform the task. The following questions suggest areas in need of investigation:

1. How can we obtain the best possible candidates for training programs? To say that counselors are born -- not made -- may be an exaggeration, and yet considerable concern has been expressed that certain personal characteristics of the counselor may be more crucial to his success in performing the guidance function than the array of courses to which he has been exposed. Selective techniques should include procedures designed to assess personality, commitment, intellect, reaction to critical incidents related to the job description, and an orientation to

social service requiring direct person-to-person contact.

2. How can we supplement the preservice preparation of persons from other disciplines? As the elementary guidance concept grows, the special competencies of other professional personnel need to be integrated into the total guidance program. This approach implies a need for the development of programs to coordinate the preparation of school social workers, school psychologists, school counselors, school nurses, and other child development specialists. An analysis of the competencies of these specialists may reveal common areas of background and preparation and identify specific limitations of certain preparation programs.

3. How can we determine the appropriate content for counselor education programs? Functions of counselors as defined by the ASCA-ACES Committee of APGA include counseling, consultation, and coordination. Specific research is needed to provide guidelines for the development of curricula that will prepare counselors to fulfill these requirements within the framework of the elementary school. Special techniques suggested by the literature may be categorized as follows:

A. Child study
   1. Case history
   2. Individual analysis
   3. Observation
   4. Counseling interview
   5. Group analysis

B. Consultation
   1. Working with teachers
   2. Working with parents
   3. Working with administrators
   4. Working with other community agencies

C. Coordination
   1. Pupil record system
   2. Testing program
   3. Parent-teacher conferences
   4. Pupil evaluation
   5. Placement, promotion, and retention
   6. Professional team staffing
   7. Referral to community agencies

4. What are the kinds of training required for subprofessional guidance personnel? It has been suggested that many functions of the professional guidance person may be acceptably performed by personnel with less than full professional training. If the special contributions of these persons can be identified, appropriate training programs need to be developed for them and procedures established to assess their effectiveness.

5. Is prior experience as a classroom teacher required to be an effective professional guidance worker? Most state certification requirements stipulate that fully qualified personnel must present evidence of successful teaching experience. In order to utilize the services of personnel from other disciplines, it will be necessary to develop flexible programs of certification for the school guidance worker. Specific studies need to be conducted to compare the

following programs: the typical secondary counselor education program, a specialized elementary counselor education program, and other pupil personnel education programs.

Organization and Administration

The proper organization of programs for providing guidance services will depend upon many variables: the specific needs within the school - community, existing school and non-school programs, the kind of personnel employed, and the organizational pattern for providing other services within the school system. A major problem in the implementation of elementary school guidance programs is the lack of real evidence upon which to base organizational guidelines that permit the adaptation of programs to the several conditions under which the services will operate. Some pertinent questions must be considered -- and possibly researched -- before guidance leaders will be able to provide the consultation that school administrators require in the establishment of guidance programs that will really make a difference in the total educational effort. Some of the questions appropriate for investigation and study that were suggested by participants of the conference are presently at various stages of resolution.

1. What is the best administrative organizational plan for various sized school systems? A report from the Interprofessional

Research Commission on Pupil Personnel Practices suggests the need to investigate certain organizational patterns:

> Pupil personnel service programs follow three basic patterns: specialists responsible to a full-time director of pupil personnel services; specialists responsible to an assistant superintendent with responsibilities in addition to pupil services; and senior specialists who coordinate the work of their associates and report directly to the superintendent of schools. An evaluation of these differently organized pupil services programs for comparable population areas is needed. At the present time, there is little research to indicate which patterns of organization are more effective.

2. What is the most effective assignment pattern for school guidance personnel? Recognizing the specific functions of the guidance personnel in a school setting -- preventive, consultative, corrective, coordinative, and developmental -- it is important that assignment patterns be analyzed to determine whether certain functions are impaired or enhanced by the pattern used. Such patterns include: full-time versus part-time guidance responsibilities, school-based personnel versus itinerant personnel serving more than one school versus centrally based personnel on call to schools, and assignments to perform specialized services such as evaluation and diagnosis, parent counseling, consultation, or other singular guidance activities.

3. How can we obtain the optimum staffing pattern for the total school program? It is possible to establish extensive,

sophisticated programs of special services at the expense of the regular instructional programs of a school. To utilize a disproportionate share of the personnel positions available in a school system for non-instructional functions could lead to the development of a program wherein overloaded, overtaxed, anxious teachers may create more problems than even an extensive clinical program can resolve. To determine the proper deployment of professional staff, studies should be conducted to compare various staffing patterns utilizing uniform staff-pupil ratios.

4. How can we provide quality guidance services to pupils in small school systems and rural areas? The problems of population density, distance, finance, and availability of personnel pose serious obstacles to providing adequate guidance services to small school systems in rural areas. Experiments involving the use of mobile guidance units, itinerant personnel, voluntary services of local residents, atypical financing to increase staff size, and a combination of functions (teacher-counselor, principal-counselor, or reading clinician-counselor) for certain personnel may suggest appropriate methods for making guidance services available to all pupils.

5. What are some of the administrative provisions that will improve the effectiveness of the school guidance worker? Special

consideration should be accorded to facilities and services that will increase counselor effectiveness: adequate school records, clerical assistance, well-planned and located office facilities, test scoring and processing services, appropriate equipment and supplies.

6. How can the schools best utilize community resources to enhance the guidance program? Utilization of local referral agencies, college or university field services, and contracted services of private practitioners may support and supplement the services provided by school personnel.

Conclusion

In spite of the problem of communication between several professional disciplines and the limited time allotment, several significant research needs were identified during the conference. While the participants agreed that guidance programs will have to be adapted to local needs and conditions, some basic practices and procedures should be researched for the purpose of formulating specific recommendations for improving the activities of counselors and developing appropriate personnel training programs. The need for additional conferences of this nature was made apparent both by the enthusiastic reaction of the participants and the lengthy list of topics suggested for investigation.

APPENDIX I

Conference Participants

Fern Adams	Coordinator of Elementary Counseling Programs Los Angeles County Public Schools Los Angeles, California
Dean C. Andrew	Academic Dean Southern State College Magnolia, Arkansas
Loretta Cass	Chief Psychologist William Greenleaf Eliot Division of Child Psychiatry Washington University St. Louis, Missouri
Gerald P. Cavanaugh	Supervising Teacher Guidance Counseling and Evaluation Denver, Colorado, Public Schools
Lawrence Claman	Director, Dallas Child Guidance Clinic and Clinical Assistant Professor of Psychiatry Southwestern Medical School Dallas, Texas
Harold Cottingham	Head, Department of Guidance and Counseling Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida
Henry Drewniany	Consultant for Elementary School Guidance Services State Department of Education Hartford, Connecticut

Muriel Gurr	Supervisor, Services Division Department of Vocational Education Phoenix, Arizona
Gilda Greenberg	Associate Professor of Psychology Fisk University Nashville, Tennessee
James Grubb	Associate Professor of Education Ohio University Athens, Ohio
E. G. Kennedy	Director of Guidance Kansas State College Pittsburg, Kansas
Betty B. Lanham	Professor of Anthropology and Sociology Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, Michigan
Walter M. Lifton	Coordinator, Pupil Personnel Services City School District Rochester, New York
Edna Maples	Consultant for Elementary School Guidance Services Colorado State Department of Education Denver, Colorado
Clyde Martin	Professor of Elementary Education University of Texas Austin, Texas
Gwen A. Nelson	Assistant Superintendent in charge of Pupil Services Wichita, Kansas
Margaret G. Quane	Supervisor of School Social Work Evanston Public School System Evanston, Illinois
William B. Royster	Coordinator of Guidance Services State Department of Education Columbia, South Carolina

Laurence Roberts	Assistant Professor of Guidance Hofstra University Hempstead, New York
William E. Truax	Coordinator of Student Personnel Preparation Programs East Texas State University Commerce, Texas
William R. Van Zandt	Dean, School of Education Arkansas State College Jonesboro, Arkansas
Clarence Webb	Past President, American Academy of Pediatrics Children's Clinic Shreveport, Louisiana
Va Loris Webb	Supervising Social Worker Jordan School District Sandy, Utah
Roy DeVerl Willey	Chairman, Department of Elementary Education University of Nevada Reno, Nevada
E. Wayne Wright	Associate Professor of Psychology Utah State University Logan, Utah

KEYNOTER

Louise Bates Ames	Director of Research Gesell Institute of Child Development New Haven, Connecticut

APPENDIX II

Guidance Counseling from the Developmental Point of View*

I am real pleased and flattered to be invited to attend this conference, but I rather question the judgment and wisdom of your committee in inviting me to give this keynote talk. I am reminded of this: earlier this fall when I was invited to attend the Cerebral Palsy Conference in Philadelphia, one of my colleagues asked me, "Well, why did they ask you? What do you know about cerebral palsy?" And I said, "Well, it isn't that I know so much about cerebral palsy, but actually anybody studying cerebral palsy is not studying cerebral palsy but studying the child who has cerebral palsy." And so the guidance people are actually working with children who need to be guided, so I assume, of course, that I would talk about children whom you are guiding perhaps more than how you are guiding them.

However, although I have made this rationalization of myself, I am reminded of the man who took part in the Johnstown flood and ever after he liked to tell everybody about it because it was about the biggest thing that ever happened to him. And so when he got to heaven, one night they said they were having a meeting that night and everyone present was going to be able to give a little talk about their most interesting experience in life. The man said, "I'd like to talk about the Johnstown flood," and the man said -- well, the man who was running the conference, the angel or whoever it was -- said, "Well, you may talk about the Johnstown flood, but I should tell you that Noah is in the audience." And I feel as though there are several Noah's in this audience tonight.

Now, the main things I would like to discuss are different kinds of guidance with emphasis on the fact that the best guidance is probably preventative and that the role of the guidance counselor is becoming increasingly complex and demanding as many of you probably realize. And I would like to discuss chiefly guidance counseling from the developmental point of view.

*Keynote Address of Louise Bates Ames delivered at the General Session, Wednesday evening, November 10, 1965, and transcribed from tape recording and edited for inclusion in this report.

Now, briefly, what does the developmental point of view maintain? We feel, those of us who work within this point of view, that behavior develops in as patterned, as predictable, a way as does physical structure. And we believe that behavior, though inevitably influenced by environmental factors, is also inevitably a function of structure. As Dr. Gesell once remarked, "Environmental factors marginate and inflect, but they do not determine the progressions of development." And one of our staff pediatricians remarked the other day that he believed the rate of development is actually determined at the time the sperm meets the egg. And you can scarcely, at the present stage of our knowledge, go behind that. And he maintained that in his clinical practice that the mothers who felt life the earliest produced children who in the first year of life then went through the progression at various stages of development a little earlier than those fetuses who start kicking late and tend to be slower developers. I can't prove this; this is just what one of our staff members commented.

Now, as Phyliss Lee Levin pointed out recently in her column in the New York Times, "Infants are actually individuals from birth." And she points out kindly that the Gesell Institute has been emphasizing this fact somewhat unpopularly ever since 1937. And I think that most of you, or many of you, realize that along with glasses, reality, therapy, and other books of that kind that we are beginning to swing a little tiny bit away from the notion that if children are in trouble it is because somebody has done something wrong, which only therapy will cure. And I imagine in some parts of the country we still -- therapists and guidance people -- are working from that point of view: that somebody screwed the child up and so they have got to unscrew him -- not recognizing the fact that some children, even before they got screwed up, may not have been the best possible material. Now the teacher and guidance counselor are, in my opinion, vital in maintaining good emotional health and in preventing breakdown. In Donahue and Neptune, an awfully good book on teaching the troubled child, which I hope some of you have read or will read, it is pointed out that quite possibly it will be the educator as much as the psychiatrist who may have the key to the prevention and mitigation of psychopathic and sociopathic tendencies which emerge in some of our young. With proper educational help, Donahue and Neptune think some children whom today we give up as lost may easily become effective members of society. They point out, and I quote, "that as the child develops the interrelationship between developing life and environment become an integral part of the emerging personality structure of the child. And when things go wrong, any deviation in either biological or psychological maturation once introduced into the pattern of development become compounded by the child's consequent repetitive failure."

Now from here on, just for a little bit, I am going to speak from notes. I am sorry to do this because I don't think it is as interesting, but the less anybody knows about a subject the more they naturally have to speak from notes. Now since this conference has to do with research in the elementary school field and especially research in elementary school guidance, I shall naturally dwell on this topic briefly. However, clearly research and guidance will depend to a very large extent on one's vision and version of what guidance is. Thus, perhaps the main part of my talk will have to do with "What Guidance Is and Needs to Be and What Kinds of Problems a Counselor Faces." Also, fortunately, later on in this conference, speakers who know a great deal more about elementary school guidance than I do will be discussing your research problems more specifically.

Now, as many of you doubtless know, in 1909 a little book Choosing a Vocation by Frank Parsons was published posthumously in Boston; this event is generally regarded as marking the beginning of the guidance movement in the United States. Now that was only as long ago as 1909, which to some of us doesn't seem as long ago as others; however, already by World War II a gentleman writing on personnel work said students are developing organisms demanding a personalized learning experience. Stress was being laid on the whole child. And to do this, according to C. Gilbert Rand in 1959, the findings of scientific psychology must be fully utilized. And all available counselors and personnel workers must know about the child's personality. Now that's just from 1909 when the work was with vocation to just the World War when already people were thinking about the whole child and his personality. This is a big change in a field in a very short time.

Some notion of guidance is probably as old as civilization itself, but as an organized movement it appears to have made its first appearance in various American cities during the first decade in this century. The earliest emphasis, as you all know, seems to have been on vocational guidance. And as early as 1894 Parsons had written "the training of a race horse and the care of sheep and chickens have been carried to the highest degree of perfection that intelligent planning can attain, but the education of a child, the choice of his employment are left very largely to the ancient, haphazard plan: the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest." And Parsons in 1908 set up the Boston Vocational Bureau. A vocational bias continued to dominate the thinking and operations of the early guidance counselors while the mental and aptitude testing movement, which developed along somewhat parallel lines during those years, helped forge many important tools for the school guidance person. And I

think most guidance people do feel that some sort of testing and diagnosis is important. Perhaps we did pay too much attention to the intelligence test for awhile, but I don't think that's any reason for swinging to the opposite extreme and giving it up entirely, although some people do. I engaged in a mildly acrimonious television debate in Boston two weeks ago with a Harvard psychiatrist and when I brashly mentioned testing, he pointed out intelligence testing is the sort of thing that a certain type of person does when he or she wants to prove a certain thing. However, regardless of how they may feel at Harvard, I still think -- although sometimes we test too widely and too wildly -- I think without diagnosis it is very hard to give any sort of treatment. So, as we came to understand more about individual differences, the guidance field broadened out to include an appreciation of such differences and to combine even educational and even personal guidance with vocational guidance.

This interest in personality adjustment went along with an increasing interest in mental health in the 1920's and following. According to a gentleman named Rudy who has written a very interesting book on education recently the new personalistic approach to pupil guidance owed much to the flourishing child-study movement, which first appeared at the turn of the century. Best embodying the main currents of this new era -- which I am pleased to say -- he says, Dr. Arnold Gesell. By 1930 personal counseling is one aspect of guidance work which was recognized as a function distinct from mere vocational educational counseling. The personal counseling movement came to stress life adjustment and a child-centered approach to education. Hugh M. Bell in 1939 stated that "the goal of counseling is facilitation of student adjustment through personal contact between counselor and student." Margaret Bennett and Harold Hand emphasized in 1938 that guidance must deal with real life adjustment problems of the whole student. Or else the guidance hour will become just so much well-intentioned but boring drivel. Tremendous spread of this work has happened since then until by now, as you all know, the National Vocational Guidance Association is in existence; the Division of Counseling and Guidance is a division of the APA; and by 1957 forty-one states required a special certificate for guidance work. As soon as they start requiring a special certificate, we know we have, to some extent, arrived.

One of our main problems now is not so much what guidance people will or should do, but there are not enough of them. And, too, the NDEA of 1948 Congress allotted over $87 million dollars to expand the guidance and testing program and to train counselors. Now all of this, in just the first half of this century, represented a tremendous expansion and improvement in the function concept of the guidance counseling. However, of late, just

as a strict Freudian point of view which seems to hold that the individual is a gentle little butterfly whose wings must not be crumpled by harsh demands from parents, school, or society is being questioned so there has been some questioning of the highly protective aspect of guidance counseling. Wrightsman in 1956 bemoaned the fact that the attitude implanted in the minds of parents by some guidance workers seem to be that one should not ask children to do anything which they regard as stuffy, tiresome, or unpleasant. He himself seemed to feel that children should be made to feel a certain pressure to learn both words and music. Similarly, former President Taylor of Sarah Lawrence warned that though the modern American child had been thoroughly and self-consciously understood by parents, teachers, and guidance specialists, this did not necessarily help the child grow into meaningful maturity; it might create new problems for the individual by freeing him of personal responsibility and giving him nothing against which to rebel. And Dr. Conant pointed out that there had apparently been no need for a comprehensive guidance program in the more rigidly stratified societies of Europe and Asia where the child knew what was expected of him. Conant points out that in Europe relatively few false hopes are awakened by too extensive an education. Americans complicate things with their democratic point of view that so much must be given to so many even though that isn't inevitably our point of view.

Now it seems to me that increasingly prevention has become a part of the guidance counselor's task. And as long ago as 1897 -- most things we do aren't entirely new -- way back at the beginning of the PTA movement a Miss Alice McClellan Birney, president of the first National Congress of Mothers, remarked that it has been truly said "to cure was the voice of the past, to prevent the divine whisper of today." In spite of this early start in this perfectly sensible notion, it is only within the last decade that national mental hygiene has been willing to devote any serious attention to the notion of prevention as even more important than curing once things went wrong. And as a recent article in The American Psychologist pointed out, until recently you had to break down before you were officially a suitable object for mental hygiene's attention. Now it is our contention at the Gesell Institute that at least fifty per cent of educational problems could be prevented even without guidance counseling if we could simply, with the help of adequate school readiness tests given by what we call a developmental guidance counselor; that is, an examiner could examine all children before they start school and then group them according to their actual readiness and potentials. Thus, to repeat -- and most of you know this better than I -- the concept of guidance counseling has come a very long way in a very few years: from sheer vocational counseling to a role which is extremely responsible in many school systems. Guidance counseling,

like social work and school psychology, is a profession whose role is being constantly redefined. This conference, I am sure, is going to make a big step in that redefinition.

Now, as examples of the kinds of things which we think guidance counselors in the early grades need to know about children in school and especially about trouble children in school, I'd like to tell you about three or four typical school behavior problem cases just as they have come to our clinical service recently. I present these cases not to show you how we work so much as to show what kinds of things we think a guidance counselor needs to know. If he or she is the kind of counselor who is going to be responsible for the personal adjustment of the child, it is important to the guidance counselor to avoid the traditional notion -- and I trust most of you do avoid this notion -- that any trouble a child is in is due to something somebody has done to him. ....and we always say, "Johnny's father could stop drinking and Johnny might not still be able to read." Now some of the main causes of learning disability which we find in clinical cases which are brought to the clinic are as follows: there is nearly always a solid reason, deep in the child's own organism, for learning difficulty. Those around him may have made it better or worse, but the main source of the difficulty seems to us to lie in the child. Most children, we think, do remarkably well, considering their basic endowment. We think fewer children than most believe are under-achievers. The usual accusation, "He could do better if he would," we think is incorrect; we think he would do if he could.

And just recently I have been gathering material for a book..... on learning problems, and to do that I took five cases just in the order in which they came into our clinical service and added seven more which I thought were interesting from last year, so there are just twelve cases on which this particular presentation is based. Of those twelve cases, these are the problems which we found most frequently in children who were having trouble in school. The outstanding reason for difficulty, in these cases which we have seen, was immaturity or unreadiness for the grade the child was in. Seven of our sample twelve children were so clearly over-placed that they needed to be held back immediately. For the five others, a possible slowing down later on was suggested. Then there is the matter of intelligence. The low intelligence was not mentioned in any referral by either parent, teacher, or, when a physician was involved, by the physician. Seven of these particular cases had an I. Q. under 100, which would naturally slow the child down somewhat, and five were under 90. Many children who are considered learning problems or behavior problems are actually emotionally disturbed or even psychotic or pre-psychotic without anyone having

officially recognized this fact people probably suspected. And two of our twelve had definitely deviant personalities. Frequently, a child who is experiencing a learning problem has an unsuspected visual problem which requires lenses or visual training. Of our twelve, eight we thought would benefit by either lenses or visual training. That's always one of our best things -- that the child has something wrong with his eyes or something you can really do quite easily and quite quickly and quite effectively. Many learning problems seem rooted in real perceptual handicap as indicated by visual examinations or on the Rorschach, which is a projective technique, which most of you probably know.

I'll just describe it briefly, if you don't, because I'm going to mention it quite a bit. The Rorschach is a series of ten cards about this size on which are printed ink blots and the child tells what he sees, and from what he tells we think we can tell a great deal about his personality. At any rate, many learning problem children do seem to have real perceptual handicap. Three of our twelve children showed such a perceptual handicap. An occasional child was brought to a clinic because he was having trouble in school, actually does need the psychotherapy which is sometimes too freely offered. And one of our twelve, we thought, did need psychotherapy right away; and I would say it is about in that proportion -- not more so than one in twelve. Now here are some of these sample cases.

This little boy was named David, five years and two months old and brought to us this September. He was an immature, out-of-bounds five-year-old who, if permitted to remain in kindergarten, would (where he was right now) become both a learning and a behavior problem. This was one we hoped to nip in the bud. This boy had had great difficulty in nursery school, and his mother had written us a letter to see *if we thought he was ready for* kindergarten this fall and we thought not. So then she phoned us and we explained we thought not; so then she entered him in kindergarten. But at any rate, the story on it -- it's nice to have this large an influence on that part of it -- at any rate, he had his difficulty in nursery school. His disruptive and out-of-bounds behavior had led his teacher, though not his parents, to question his readiness for kindergarten. The social worker at the Jewish Community Center Nursery School, which he had attended, repeatedly commented on his disruptive influence; she felt there was a likelihood of a deep-seated anxiety. One day in fifteen minutes he threw a hammer, spit at several children, emptied two buckets of water, urinated in one child's face (his mother said the little girl got in the way, but the teacher thought it was the boy's fault). Now the other children were relieved when this little boy didn't come to school, and we always consider this a very black mark against a child if the other children are glad when he doesn't come.

This is a sign that something is wrong. Well, we examined this nice little boy; oh, yes, the mother thought he just behaved badly because he was a boy -- he was really too smart. Well, the findings on his I. Q. was 103 which is okay. His behavior scattered from three to five years, centering around a four-year level. His copy forms, incomplete man, mosaic, and visual exam all showed him right around four; now there is nothing wrong with that, but it doesn't show readiness for kindergarten. An incomplete man is the stick figure of a man which a child is asked to finish, only .... adding a belly button and eyes and only left the man with one arm and one leg. On the Rorschach the response was immature, out-of-bounds, and it was a four-year-old response. His correct form was only sixty-six per cent which is too low; that is a three and one-half-year-old level of accuracy. There was a lot of silly talk; on card five he said, "Ladies, skip to my Lou" and on seven he said, "Man with shoes doing skip, skip, skip," and he got up and skipped all around the room. And the visual exam showed him to be right at a good four-year-old level. Now this is a good example of a child who would almost certainly become both a learning and behavior problem if allowed to continue in kindergarten at this time because he was just plain not ready, although of normal intelligence.

His family at first resisted this notion, and when we explained that his incomplete man having only a belly button and eyes wasn't up to a five-year-old level, his father said, "You mean he just doesn't conform to your stereotype of a five-year-old." But all of a sudden, the parents kind of relaxed and collapsed; they must have known anyway before they brought him that he really wasn't ready just suddenly. Dodge Elders, the clinician, talks to parents very nicely so that even if the child is dreadful she tells the truth but she tells it in such a nice friendly way that they get the feeling that she really is nice, and then they are able to accept what she is saying. I am more apt to come right out with it, and it doesn't work quite as well. At any rate, all of a sudden they said, "That's right, he really isn't ready for kindergarten." Well it may seem if we had been through quite a lot since we knew to start with, but at any rate this worked out fine.

Now here is another boy that came in the fall. This is a boy, Martin, seven years and five months old. He is a boy with normal intelligence but with a marked perceptual handicap. The presenting problem was that he was seven and a-half, just starting second grade but he couldn't read. His mother reports that his lack of ability to read frustrated him, which is natural. The school says that he has a high I. Q. and should be able to read, but the teacher says that he is one of the most beguiling and fascinating children she had ever taught and she said, "I love him." And you could see

why. He was red-headed, massive, muscular, this little crew-cut hair, this little freckle face, a very bright looking little boy, from a real good family that had given all the advantages including skiing in Switzerland, but he couldn't read. So, they brought him in and we examined him. His I. Q. was 119 which should in a reading family allow a child to read, but in the developmental exam he showed himself clearly operating from a four to six-year-old base, although he was seven and one-half. However, the Rorschach, more than any other test, pinpointed his difficulty. This is the nice thing about giving a whole battery of tests, by a whole group of people, because you never know where your answer is going to lie. This boy had a highly restricted Rorschach and it was highly inaccurate. His correct form, which by seven and one-half should be at least eighty per cent, if not higher, was forty-three per cent -- that is below a two-year-old level. He sees things less accurately than the average two-year-old; he has less than a fifty-fifty per cent chance of seeing things the way they are. His perceptual world is not a normal world; he sees little bits and pieces which aren't accurate and he kind of puts them together in a big blob which also isn't accurate. Now on the visual exam he showed a fuzzy and very slow response; his acuity at near was down and it wasn't improved by plus lenses; his ....to a fuzzy. There was a marked restriction to his response with no immediate way evident of bringing improvement. We felt that visual training later on might help him but right at this point we sent him to a good gland man for a hormonal appraisal because it almost seemed that with good equipment, being used so dreadfully bad, there must be, we hoped, some solid physical reason why things are just not clicking at all. So, the summarying prescription: this is an engaging, attractive boy, bubbling with life and responsive to whatever is asked of him. His parents say he is a delightful, easy child to rear; he just plain can't read. He isn't a remedial reading problem; he doesn't read well enough for remedial reading. He does, at this time, need to be put back in the first grade, but even here he will have trouble. A slower course in school, shorter assignments, special individual training at a very primitive level, and the use of symbols will help. And I hope as we gradually improve our curricula we will be able to do more about perceptual training. A check on his endocrine picture, we hope, will reveal something that can be done and after that visual training will be indicated. At least we can contradict the school's original comment, that "with his high intelligence he ought to be doing better if he really tried."

Now here is a boy, the last one I will tell you about, although these cases are very fascinating to us. This is a boy nine years and three months old who showed real emotional disturbance. He was in the fourth grade, but he had had trouble in school right along; he was the biggest devil the nursery school teacher had ever seen. He is extremely over-active at home and

demands an unusual amount of attention. Academic work at school is adequate but his constant attention-getting devices disturb the class. The findings: his I. Q. was 115, but on a developmental exam many things were down at three and one-half to four and little above a seven or eight-year level, and he is nine - three. His level of response was highly variable; growth is a lot of little episodes not integrated -- he doesn't move all in one piece, along any steady front. And here again the Rorschach seemed to pinpoint his trouble. It came as a real shock to those who knew this boy because it showed that something was dreadfully wrong with him, and even a layman could tell from the Rorschach response that something was wrong even though you don't know the technical details of the Rorschach. He showed at least seven what we call danger signals -- that is, signs of emotional disturbance. We expect at least one and one-half of these signs in a normal child; five on the average in the disturbed child; and this boy, whom no one had treated as if he had a real emotional disturbance -- they just treated him as though he ought to behave better -- had seven of these things. There is a lot of confabulation of the desire content to severation. And he would say such things as "a terrible ant with blood dripping out of him is attacking something to eat" and there was a lot of this really wild content. His correct form was only seventy-one per cent. His sentence completion dealt almost completely with his brother -- how mean his brother was, his brother chases him, hits him, and he hates his brother, and he wants he should kill his brother, and his brother is dumb. Well, at any rate, our summarying prescription was: this is a boy who needs right away psychotherapy. For the rest he would benefit by a highly structured situation. He would do best in an ungraded private school, if that could be found. His parents must appreciate that he will not improve right away: if by his mid-twenties he is in adequate control of himself, that will be fortunate. And I think it is hard for some parents of disturbed children to realize how long it is going to be before they can really hope to get them back on the track. Carter is a clear example of a boy who is disturbed and whose disturbing behavior is based on a clear-cut emotionally disturbed personality; thus, he will need every protection that a highly structured environment can offer. School and home have been putting up with only a minimal complaint with a more disturbed child than they should be trying to handle without help. And it is important in your handling and attitude to know whether a child has normal potential or is just behaving badly and whether he really is laboring under the handicap or a real disturbance.

Of course, our feeling is that although naturally all guidance counselors aren't going to be psychologists unless you know quite a lot about the structure of the child it is going to be hard for you to give your most effective guidance.

And now I would like to give you a brief summary of our own work on school readiness simply because I think that a lot of the problems that come to you wouldn't need to come to you -- you could actually cut down on your case load -- if we didn't allow these problems to develop. I am going to tell a little about this work on school readiness because I'd like for you people, so nicely gathered from all over the country, to know what we are doing and also because it is our belief -- as I say -- that if proper evaluation of school readiness were made in the beginning you just wouldn't have as much work on your hands. And I do believe that the actual role of guidance counselor could change as the number and type of problems which confront you change.

Now, I'll tell you first how we came to work in the educational field at all. We didn't just sit down and think we would like to work on school readiness. So many of the cases that were brought to our clinic were educational problems and so many of these children were over-placed that we decided we would like to do a little research and found out just how bad the situation was. And since this is a little bit serious -- this aspect of the talk -- I'd like to first tell you one of my favorite school readiness jokes. This is a story of a little six-year-old who is an only child and so naturally her family was most interested in everything that happened to her, and each afternoon when she got home from school they would ask how school had been that day. So one day in the spring the father asked the little girl how school was and she said they had a great time in school that day. "But," she said, "Sister let us plant seeds in the plant pots and we are going to see if they grow, but we ran out of dirt so she let me go out in the yard to get some more dirt." Then the little girl said, "Daddy, I was out there all alone. I could have escaped." And we often wonder that more children don't escape when we see what difficult situations we put them into.

Well, among the children who came to the clinic who were having trouble in school -- in the last five, six, eight years -- nearly all of them were over-placed. And so we asked ourselves: would this be true if you went into an ordinary school or is it only true of children who are troubled enough to come to a clinic? So this is what we wanted to find out. A clinical service had led us to believe that age alone was not an adequate criterion for determining when a child should start school and I. Q. alone is not an adequate criterion because a child can be bright but immature. In fact, these are some of the children whom we wish most to protect -- what we call the superior immatures, unquestionably bright but just not ready for the task that they are put into. And so, with much appreciated help from Ford, we went into a school in southern Connecticut -- the

School in Weston, and we examined the entire kindergarten class which is around eighty children -- that is four different classes, of course -- but the whole population: one first grade and one second grade. We examined them in the fall of 1957, the fall of 1958, and the fall of 1959, and I'll tell you just briefly what we wanted to find out. I'll tell you what tests we used and I'll also tell you briefly what we did find out.

We wanted to find out how many of these children entered on the basis of age alone were over-placed in our judgment. Then we wanted to find out: did the unready ones catch up? People are always saying, "He is a little bit immature, but he'll catch up." And then we wanted to find out: could we predict in the fall of any school year what the teacher would actually say come spring? Since this was research, we weren't telling the teachers what we found; but if you could find out in a twenty-minute exam in the fall those children who were going to fail the year, obviously you would be saving a lot of time and trouble and money and emotion. Now the tests we used were of three kinds although only one kind we deem essential. Since I was there, and available, and since I do like to use projective tests, I did try the Rorschach and the Lowenfeld Mosaic. I think the Rorschach is too difficult to use in the situation although it's always informative in the hands of a trained person, but it's pretty complicated. The Lowenfeld Mosaic, which I won't go into, but if any of you haven't heard of it, it is a real good test; it does tell a lot, but it isn't essential. Since one of our staff optometrists is available, we did a thorough visual exam on each child. And this is terribly, terribly important, but this we can't try to sell everybody immediately because it's going to be a long time before we have good visual coverage in the school. If just people, especially anybody in Washington, could take back the message that the Snelling test is a very poor way of deciding what a child's visual ability is; it tells what a child's acuity is, but you can have good acuity and still have lousy eyes. So, it would almost be better not to fool around at all because a lot of children bring back the message home that their eyes are okay because they have good acuity, you see, and people aren't looking out for all this visual difficulty which is lurking right there, unfortunately.

Well, at any rate, this is a good thing to know, but it isn't part of the work I'm telling you about tonight. The essential part of a readiness test is a simple developmental exam which is described in our book School Readiness which is happily available -- Harper and Rowe is the publisher. It is just a series of rather simple eye, hand, coordination tests that tell how far the child, as a functioning organism, has come. And I'll give you an example of two of the simplest tests: one is to copy a circle. When a child, take a right-handed child to make it easy -- when a child first copies a circle, he tends to go round and round and round, but when he gets

by the round and round and round stage, when he can inhibit and go round just once, he tends to start at the top as the right-handed adult tends to, go around counter-clockwise and stop at the top. This would be, say at three years of age or so in an ordinary child. Six months later the same child, for growth reasons, which we don't fully understand, starts at the bottom, goes around clockwise and is apt to tie his little circle up with a knot. Six months later the child doesn't need the little knot, but he comes down hard on the down side and it's around five and one-half to six -- around the time when we think a child is beginning to be ready for some sort of really academic teaching -- that the child again starts at the top and goes around this way. Why this developmental change we don't know, but we see it in nearly all children. One other simple, but extremely revealing, test which we like to give is incomplete man test; this is the stick figure of man with a round stomach and a hand and arm on one side and a leg and foot on the other side and nose, mouth, ear, and hair on one side. You ask the child to finish the man. Obviously, as he gets older he adds more parts, but it isn't the number of parts that tell you so much about him as what the parts look like. We have studied thousands of children making incomplete men over a period of time, and so we have a pretty good idea of how each limb changes with age. Here is an arm that is already on the man: when a child first adds an arm, it starts below the knee, goes straight down, and is very long. Six months later the arm starts out from about the knee level, doesn't point so far down and isn't quite so long. About four years of age, it comes straight up from the waist. And about the time he becomes ready to read and write, it comes up and matches the other arm. So you see, without the child's thinking about it -- because I don't think a three-year-old thinks -- he will add this kind of an arm. You say, "What does the man need?" He says, "Arm." And he makes you an arm, you see, just immediately. That arm, as the child grows older, is moving up, is turning up, and it is pulling itself in. The eyes at first are big scribbles, then they are smaller scribbles, then they are round circles, then they get to be small dots, then they open up and have a pupil, and then they open up slant-wise and have a pupil. About four to four and one-half, many children add a belly button to man. By five, if they feel impelled to add anything, they say "Button" and just look sort of embarrassed and say he doesn't really need anything more. So, if you have a six-year-old child who has added a long arm to the man and a belly button to the man and started the circle at the bottom you would have very good clues right there, in our estimation, that this is a child who is acting like a younger child.

Well, that is the sort of tests that we give. Now, what we did find out was that, in our judgment, of all the kindergarten children tested, thirty-seven per cent were fully ready for kindergarten and to go on to first grade

next year; forty-two per cent were ready for kindergarten, but only for an intermediate class the next year; and nineteen per cent were plain not ready. And the figures were the same for the higher grades. As for consistency from one test to the other, there was very high consistency. Few unready children later turned out to be ready. In the first grade, the consistency was highest; it was ninety-five per cent consistent. Now, as to the agreement to teacher's findings, the best agreement was with kindergarten teachers' findings; that was better than with teachers in the later grades. Kindergarten teachers can see children more clearly as they are than any other teachers in this respect. A kindergarten teacher in June can say flatly, and without any fear of contradiction or embarrassment, that this child is not ready to go on into first grade. She doesn't feel that she has failed or the child has failed or the school has failed; she just feels that the child is too immature. In the subsequent grades the tendency is to feel that maybe he could do it, or maybe if you taught a little harder -- there is more feeling in the later grades.

At any rate, in the kindergarten class, there was eighty-three per cent agreement in what the teachers found in the spring and in what we had predicted in the fall. All the fully readies turned out to be ready; all the unreadies were unready; there was some difference of opinion about the questionables. . .Some whom we questioned the teacher wanted to hand on; now this is quite understandable. It is very easy for psychologists doing research to say, "I don't think this child is ready." Nobody does much to the psychologists -- it's a different matter for the teacher. Now, our interest in these children naturally continued although that particular project ended, so we checked with these same kindergarten children when they were in the sixth grade, and the sixth graders were divided into four divisions: from best to worst. Of those whom we had thought ready as they entered kindergarten, by sixth grade, sixty-seven per cent were in the top group; eleven per cent in the second group; twenty-two per cent in the third group; and none in the bottom group. Conversely, of those whom we thought fully unready, none were in the first two groups in sixth grade. Thirty-six per cent were in the third group and sixty-four per cent were in the bottom group. There was actual correlation between what you predict at the beginning of kindergarten and what these children actually do in sixth grade. The correlation between their grouping in sixth grade and our early prediction was .7; the correlation between their grouping in sixth grade and their I. Q. was .49 so actually a behavior test in this instance appears to be a better predictive test than an I. Q. test.

Well, then just briefly what we have done since we have finished this work in Weston. It made it seem evident to us that many children, at least

one-third in each class were over-placed on the basis of age alone. So we thought we would like to write up these tests in book form and tell how they should be given. We did need norms, and so we went into a school in North Haven where the children seemed normative, the mean I. Q. was about 105, and the average socio-economic status of the parents was rather modest. We examined until we had fifty girls and fifty boys at each age level from five through ten and from that we made our norms. Then a very nice thing happened. Sometimes, when you are doing research in a school -- as some of you may know -- the school is usually nice about it, but they don't always act as if it were the biggest treat that came their way, but in this school they would say, "When you are here next week, do you think you could take a look at this one?" or "Do you suppose you could possibly have time to examine that one?" This, of course, makes you -- if you are in the theoretical realm of things -- makes you feel very pleased inside. So at the end of norm gathering, North Haven asked us if we could get support from Ford would we come back on a three-year demonstration project, screening all the kids as they came into kindergarten and then group them accordingly. We did get the money and we did go to North Haven. The three years are over and the honeymoon is slightly over, but I must say we learned a lot and we think that the whole thing worked out pretty well.

Now, what we did. We examined the children in a cut-down exam, just a screening exam which would be a copy form and the incomplete man as they came to school in the spring to be registered. A lot of the children, obviously, were not ready, and we would say they were not ready. A lot of the parents would say, "Great, I knew he wasn't ready," but some of the parents would say, "I don't care if he is ready or not, he's going to school." But that didn't present any severe problems because you can teach four-year olds just as well as you can teach five-year olds; you just teach them something different. So, we had four divisions in the kindergarten: the readies, the not-quite readies, the hardly readies, and the not-readies-at-all. Groups three and four, naturally, would spend two years in kindergarten, and everyone seemed pleased -- probably -- would probably spend two years in kindergarten; everyone is pleased about this except the parents of the Group Four children who just didn't like it. So, the next year we renamed the groups. Now, it is obvious that if a child isn't ready for school, that is, kindergarten, I mean if he needs his nap in the afternoon, he is not ready for kindergarten. So the more ready children came in the afternoon. So Group One became the fully-ready afternoons; Group Two the less-ready afternoons, Group Three the fully-ready mornings, and Group Four the less-ready mornings. And everybody was happy. And that really did work out pretty well.

Now that we have finished our preliminary work in both of these types of schools and written our book, we have started having what we call

workshops -- school readiness workshops -- and we have these for two weeks in October and April and June. We can handle about twenty to twenty-five people who come from all over the country and from all different disciplines. We have psychologists, social workers, psychiatrists, we have had a pediatrician, school principals, and sometimes actual school teachers -- kindergarten or first grade teachers who are going to be released by their schools to just do this kind of testing -- and who will do this testing is something which I think each community is going to have to work out for itself. I, being a psychologist, feel that a psychologist is a rather logical person to do it. Dr. ..... being an M. D. feels that perhaps someone besides a psychologist. And one kind of person who might very well do this testing, of course, guidance workers. In one school we have a school nurse doing it. It is a matter of temperament and training more than your actual formal educational background, I think. In some instances, teachers -- if they can be released by the school from their other work -- do become very good developmental examiners because it isn't just a matter of examining a child and putting him somewhere. Having put him somewhere you have got to be sure you have put him in the right place and then you have got to watch and see how he fits in the group and then you have got to help the teacher with her adaptation to the group. And, of course, the next thing -- once you have got everybody grouped -- then you will be in a good position to improve curriculum. As long as you have kids at six different levels in one class, as you do in many schools today -- or as you do in the ungraded primary and they are working it out -- if you have kids at too many different levels, you are not in a position to feel the group as a whole thing, and until you can feel the whole group as a ..... acting -- almost like an individual -- then it is going to be hard to improve your curriculum.

Well, what we are doing this year. We continue to get some help from Ford, and we are working in four schools now: ....., California; Bennington, University City, and Cheshire. Each of these school systems sent one or two developmental examiners to be trained by us, and they have gone back and they are screening kids before they get to school. They are grouping on developmental basis, and Dr. Elger, one of our local consultants, goes around to these different schools. They are all working out pretty well, but I must say in compliment to any California people who are here that ..... is working out the best. And, actually, the State Department in California has become much interested in this project and is now seeking funds to spread this kind of work throughout the state. This would be the most helpful thing we could do if we could have large numbers of children examined and grouped. Then we would find out what we were really working at. The role of this developmental guidance counselor -- that is Dr. Elger's

term for the person who does the examining -- is first that they would give these examinations individually; they would then group the children; they would then supervise and check the actual teaching in the groups; and then we would hope they would be able to start working on the curriculum; and then in the older grades or in any groups any child who was in trouble would be examined again to find out what that child is like and what is his problem.

Now I would like to say just a word, although this may seem just a little removed from a guidance counselor's role, about teeth and vision. Any aspect of the child's behavior can be a clue to you as to what that child is like, and you see we are going in the opposite extreme from the point of view that prevailed so long to look at all the forces around the child; obviously, we are looking harder and harder at the child himself. Now, let's think about teeth for a minute. There are three factors which normally and ideally go hand in hand. That is the child's chronological age, his physiological age, and his behavior age, and ideally they go along with each other. A six-year-old looks like a six-year-old and acts like a six-year-old, and this is because it is so often true that we can enter children in school on the basis of age and not have any more trouble than we do. It's because it isn't always true that we like to have individual exams, but if you can't have those, then if you know two of these factors, it gives you a good guess to the third. Well, you do know the child's chronological age, and so if you can tell his physiological age you have a good clue. Now it is true that some children who are physically mature are immature in their behavior, and vice versa, but often these things do tell you about each other. Now, ideally, you would check on the development of the child's wrist bones; you get an X-ray of the wrist bones, but this is not always practical. You can nearly always get a child to open his mouth and you can look at his teeth. From what we know as to our expectations of teething, we can get a good idea as to whether the child is ahead of or behind schedule in his teething. I hope the people who are frowning in the audience are just tired and not terribly unhappy about the idea of teeth, but at any rate we do know that you expect lower central incisors to come in around five and one-half to six years of age and you expect the upper central incisors around six and one-half. If the child is very much behind that schedule, we say, at least, look out -- that is, if you have a second grade child whose baby teeth are all clamped right in there tightly -- the chances are that you have an immature child. Checking our kindergarten children in Weston, correlating the behavior exam response, and the school responses later reported by the teachers, with teething, all of our Weston children of those ahead of schedule in teething, sixty per cent were in the top group academically; thirty-six per cent were doing well or fairly well; only four per cent were doing badly. Of those behind schedule in teething, six per cent only were in the top group; forty per cent were questionable; and

fifty-four per cent did repeat or should repeat. So, we do think that teething can be a clue. Now, how the I. Q. fits into all of this, it can be ahead of or behind physiological age; it can be ahead of or behind behavior age, but it's not the thing that you go by.

Now just a word about vision. Even more important than teething, because after all you don't study with your teeth, is vision. Little has been known up to now about the developing stages of a child's vision, so educators can't be blamed for not having taken this into account. Although we won't go so far as to say every school should have an optometrist on the staff, we wish every school could check, could have a consulting optometrist check the child's vision because -- I wouldn't say in every case where there is a school problem that it is a visual problem -- I think you will be surprised to find in how many school problem cases there is a clear visual problem which could be corrected. More of our children today do have visual troubles than most people suspect.

Now you will be happy to see me -- as the Superintendent of Schools in New York City was speaking at Cleveland the other night and we were all very tired and he skipped a whole big bundle of pages and we were all real pleased -- skip a few pages.

Now here is something I would just like to mention. And this is the teacher-child relationship. This is a little poem that a psychiatrist in Yorktown Heights, New York, wrote, and I thought it was quite nice. He claimed that institutional mechanisms, such as tracts, team teaching, remedial specialists, and the psychological corps, as symbols of how fragmented the teacher-pupil relationship has become and how desperately difficult it has become to provide a complicated generation of complicated children with an education without a breakdown. This is his poem which says today's tract child might say:

Where did my teacher go?
I lost him along the way.
Where did my teacher go?
There is no one left to say.
I went to reading, writing, and arithmetic today,
But where did my teacher go?

Now, just a few comments on guidance and measurement and the value of testing and diagnosis before you do guide. Thorndike has commented that whatever exists at all exists in some amount; to know it thoroughly involves knowing its quantity as well as its quality; to measure a product well means to define its amount so that competent persons will know how large it is with

some precision and this knowledge may be recorded and used. And although the course of testing has had many ups and downs I do feel that we mustn't forget to diagnose.

Now, just a couple comments on research in guidance counseling. There is an old quote from William McDougall which is repeated in the September, 1965, issue of Contemporary Psychology: he pointed out that to obscure questions of fact with which the psychologist deals, it is in the nature of things impossible always to return answers supported by indisputable experimental proofs. In psychology the evidence of an author's approximation toward the truth can consist only in his success in gradually persuading competent opinion of the value of his views. Or, as William Shelton has pointed out, the tea taster is not considered ineffective because he cannot quantitatively support his tea-tasting conclusion. It is fortunate that at least according to the promise of the program of this conference others far more informed than I in the field of guidance are going to discuss the details of research in this field. I think perhaps I am more qualified to comment on what such research should not be than on what it should be. As Dr. Beezer knows, and I'm awfully sorry he's not here yet tonight, I had the privilege of two years of a very enlightening experience as a member of one of the panels of the Cooperative Research Branch of HEW. And my feeling was then, and continues to be, that we need much more of what people call natural science type of research or fishing expeditions. That is, qualified people trying to find out something, and I know Washington doesn't entirely approve of this, but there are some small specific areas of education where research can be very precise. In the more general field of teaching and guiding our boys and girls, it is very hard to know exactly what it is you are going to measure. Our knowledge of human behavior remains so imprecise, individual differences are so great, our methods of guiding, grouping, and teaching are so inexpert, and as Dr. Beezer also knows -- and this is not a surprise to anybody -- in my brief Washington experience, I constantly took issue with other members of our panel because, in my opinion, very little research was ever funded which I believed was going to help any single teacher or guidance person do a better job with any real children. Our panel, like many, laid great stress on correct research methodology to the extent that I used to accuse them of preferring to do the wrong thing right than the right thing wrong. This has long been an error in psychology and education: our research method is often altogether too precise for the material we are dealing with. A fishing expedition would consist of qualified people, whomever everybody admitted were good people, setting up a reasonable -- though not necessarily statistically admirable -- teaching or guidance situations and then finding out how things worked.

I think you have to go through a stage first before you are ready to set up this precise -- more precise -- research. In medicine if you cure one person, then another, then another, with some brave new medicine, then people think this is great, and then they start on trying to collect a mass data. In education and guidance I think just one teacher or parent saying he is a changed child because of this some simple thing you may do -- I think this could be a meaningful clue that somebody may be on the right track. But nobody is going to say he is a changed child unless you actually try some things. So in planning for research in guidance, remember that guidance is not entirely apart from all the rest we are trying to do in education. If we are educating in a more reasonable way, your task will be less and easier. So I think guidance people should aim at not only trying to prevent personal problems by their effective guidance but also if they can to help prevent educational problems by adding their knowledge to that of the educator in trying to help him run the whole educational system more smoothly. Regardless of how excellent the research methodology of the proposed project may be, more thought should be given as to whether it is sensible and reasonable and fits into what we know of child behavior and perhaps less to its scientific accuracy of approach.

In our panel in Washington I found an admirable knowledge of statistics and a shocking lack of information -- any information whatsoever -- about child behavior. Team teaching is a good example of research which might better never have been started if the people who thought it up had known a little bit more about children. And much work on under-achievement, again statistically accurate, tells you very little about the performance of actual children; and much seems based on this erroneous notion which I mentioned earlier: he could do better if he would, which I don't think is correct. Much work, much research, and much actual teaching with top groups is based on the notion that a higher I. Q. is all that is needed for academic research. There are many bright little kids struggling along in top groups who don't belong there. And I am reminded of the primary teacher who was on a committee I headed in our recent Connecticut State Evaluation of Mental Hygiene and what's being done in it, and her statement as we discussed special services and their value was, "One more special service and I'll scream." And she maintained that if the classes could be small and made up of children who were really ready for those classes, there would be much less need for outside special services. So, in summary, guidance counseling as you all know has come a fantastically long way since the beginning of this century when the term guidance counseling was synonymous with vocational counseling. The role and goal of our guidance counselors is constantly changing to keep pace with our newest notions in

education and our newest knowledge about human behavior. The work of the counselor is becoming increasingly preventative and is more and more tied up not only with the whole child but with the whole educational effort. At least one role which we see is very vital for the guidance counselor is what we call the developmental guidance counselor whose task is to diagnose readiness for school, to supervise grouping and placement once the child is in school. The task of the counselor would be lessened, though the complexity of what he has to do may be increased, if we could do a better job of seeing that every child is correctly placed in school. The guidance counselor's philosophy will, of course, to a large extent determine how he works. Does he look to the child himself for the answer for most of the child's problems, or does he feel that the problems are a result of something that has been done to the child? Precision counseling, in my opinion, still needs to be more exploratory than definitive. I personally feel that we should not be too ambitious about the scientific elegance of our research.

And, in conclusion, I'd like to tell a joke which I heard in North Carolina. It's a story of an elderly guidance counselor who died and went to heaven (and you may know this joke) and St. Peter asked her if she would like to see the list of the schools where she was going to work; and she said she didn't know that she had to keep on being a guidance counselor after she went to heaven. But he said, "Yes, that's what you do; you have to keep right on with what you were doing on earth." So he showed her a list of three large schools with many children in them, and she said she couldn't possibly be responsible -- and asked how many assistants she could have. He said, "None, you have to have this whole task to yourself." So she said she couldn't possibly do it. So he said, "You have a choice; you can go to the other place." So she said that it couldn't be worse than this, so she went down to the other place. The devil asked her if she would like to see the list of people that she would be responsible for and she said that she would, rather apprehensively. He showed her one little short list of one little school, and she said, "Well, how many other schools do I have?" And he said, "That's all. We have just small case loads down here." And she said, "How can it be so bad in heaven and so nice down here?" And he said, "We don't have any guidance counselor shortage down here."

APPENDIX III

Research Designs -- Cooperative Research Grants Now Available -- Cooperative Research Projects Related to Elementary School Guidance*

. . . I think I should explain to you how these conferences come about. Someone in my office -- such as myself -- gets an idea that we ought to get some research in an area where there is no research, or positive research, or that the research that has been done isn't so hot, and we ought to do something about it. Then we call up several of the specialists in the area or the appropriate area and talk it over with them. So, of course, I called Dr. Camp and I called Louise Eckerson, Hy Smith, and I asked them what they think. Of course, they said "Amen," and I asked for names of people who might be willing to coordinate such an activity. From among the names presented to me I selected Miss Smith.

. . . I also want to thank each and every one of you for coming here because I know all of you are busy people, and on behalf of the Office of Education, I want to express our sincere appreciation for your taking the time to come here and pool your talents to see if we could come up with something that would be helpful in the field of elementary guidance. We sincerely appreciate the time you are giving to this.

Now, let me explain something briefly about the conference and seminar businesses we have at the Office of Education. These fall under the category of what we call developmental activities and it all came about by virtue of the fact that when I first joined the Office -- having come from a background of eight years of full-time research experience -- I was given the responsibility, among other things, of reading all the final reports of the research projects that we had gotten into up to that time. While I was reading those, something occurred to me that has occurred to me many times in my career and that is that although we do a great deal of discreet research in behavioral sciences, we don't engage in enough collaborative effort. I was a chemist before I became a psychologist, and I was in Oak Ridge for two years; this is why I think of this analogy. I refelcted on the several centuries of discreet research projects -- thousands of them in

*Address of Robert H. Beezer delivered at General Session, Thursday evening, November 11, 1965, as transcribed from tape recording and edited for inclusion in this report.

physics, mathematics, and chemistry -- discreet projects which antedated the advent of the atomic bomb; but it took a collaborative effort to the tune of two billion dollars before we made that dramatic break-through. And so I thought: why don't we pool together some people? So the first thing was a seminar kind of concept. A lot of people, who are top people in their field, bring them together -- let's take a look at where we have come in this area and see if we can't develop some guidelines as to where we ought to go from here. . . .And so I conceived the idea of bringing people together to work for several weeks in seminars to see if we couldn't come up with, among other things, collaborative attacks on problems.

The first seminar was conducted by me at the University of Wisconsin in mental retardation. That is not my specialty, but we had already put so much money in MR research that we thought: let's take a look at where we had come -- not just in cooperative research, not OE supported, but any research in the United States -- and see if we could develop some guidelines for where we should go from here. One of the things that I hoped this group of people would be able to come up with were ideas of collaborative research. So, let's take for example one of the topics we dealt with -- now this is only one. Early identification -- much of MR is considered . . . due to cultural deprivation and not to inheritive causes. And so, if you will, visualize just for a moment a square divided into five parts, each of these representing a project. We came up with guidelines for each project within that square, published it, and would hope that Harvard, for example, would take a look at Part One and say, "Well, we would like to take a crack at that part." Wisconsin, Part Two, Minnesota, Part Three, and so on. . . draw up their research proposals for these various parts, do a round-robin with their proposals so that we could coordinate the efforts so that now we have a massive assault on the problem of early identification. . . unlike one lone investigator down there chewing away at this great gargantuan problem.

Well, it occurred to us that we needed something then after we got started with this; we needed something other than seminars to try to get research started in an area in which there is no research or positive research. That is why we have a conference here -- because we have practically no research having been done on elementary school guidance. We hope that perhaps we are going to be able to get something going here as a result of this conference.

Another thing I think I should explain to you is that we get a lot of complaints in the Office of Education addressed to the Commissioner, people in high circles in the office, and to Congressmen -- the little colleges and universities don't get much of our money. And that is true.

If you would look back in a publication which lists all our projects you will find a high incidence of projects coming out of the big universities, and so, where is the money for us? Well, let me show you what happens when you try to help small colleges and universities, and I have had very painful experiences in this. I am the only one on the staff who has been willing to do it, and this is not because I am so magnanimous, it is just that I have been willing to do what I possibly could to help the little schools. I call up a small school and say, "Well, look, someone has suggested that you might be willing to coordinate a research conference or seminar, and I want to try to get something going on attitudes and value changes among college students,who are the problem college students, or the non-intellective correlation of achievement, or how do you counsel students who don't go to college, etc., etc., etc."

But I call one person and say, "I would like you to coordinate on attitudes and value changes." "Fine, this is wonderful....flattered." So I tell them practically what words to put in the proposal because we don't make the decision; a research and advisory council, an outside group, makes the decision on these things. I say, "Please send it to me, and I will send you further instructions; send me a draft copy first; I will revise it, send it back to you, then you send me twenty official copies, and we will mail it out to the Research and Advisory Council." Weeks pass. Nothing happens. I call up: "Hey, what about my proposal?" "Busy, busy." And that's right; when you teach twelve to fifteen hours a week, you are busy, but the fact remains, I don't have the proposal, you see. So, we are going to get it in. Weeks pass. Months pass. No proposal. Finally comes a letter. "Sorry, we are going to have to buck out." Now I call up another small college and I go through the same routine. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have eight such conferences and seminars that have been on my books for two and one-half years -- they have never gotten off the ground.

The same routine. Now, if I had called up Michigan or Harvard or California, I would have gotten my proposals just in about two weeks. Now, one of the problems we have in small colleges and universities in this regard is the fact that you don't have the large numbers of people you have in the large universities. . .

Another problem we have in our small schools with regard to our giving them more of the funds that are available is that the vast majority of the people who go to small colleges and universities are service oriented, not research oriented. There isn't anything wrong with that; I haven't said

there is. But this is a fact. The big universities tend to want research oriented people, and as a consequence, the undergraduate, as you well know, suffers a great deal by this. What happened at Berkeley could just as well have happened in most of our major universities in the United States. The undergraduate is getting cheated, and he knows it, and he is getting fed up with it.

And another problem in the small colleges and universities is that the people just don't have time to do the research. If you are going to step out of line half-time, one-fourth time, to do research, who is going to teach the classroom? . . . So you see that it isn't that we are showing favoritism to our large universities. They just tend to emphasize research more, and I'm not convinced that every institution of higher learning should get in on the research act. . . . .But the point I'm trying to get across is that we aren't showing favoritism -- quite the contrary -- we try to help in any way that we can.

Now, what I have just described for you, this business of calling somebody up and waiting and waiting, did not happen in the case of Miss Smith. She was very prompt, but, unfortunately, when she got her proposal in, we were out of money. And I thought, of all times, when here is one person from a small school who is really johnny-on-the-spot, and what happens? I fall down on my commitment to her. Why did we run out of money? Well, because our small contract program which provides funds for small research up to about nine thousand dollars just got out of hand. . . . . and so this conference is over a year late, but we finally made it, thanks to Miss Smith and to all of you who have come here. . . . this is the first of these conferences that I have attended because I couldn't attend all that I have stimulated, and I didn't want to show favoritism, but I don't mind showing favoritism to this one.

Now, another thing that I would like to repeat that I have already said today: this conference is not being held for the Office of Education; it is being held for those of you who, we presume, have a concern for the problem that we are addressing ourselves to; the Office of Education is merely providing you with the where-with-all to get together and pool your ideas. Please remember that you are not doing it for the United States Office of Education.

Now tonight I would like first of all to mention briefly the type of research and research-related activities which we support in the Office of Education. Then I want to provide you with some details about how we process a research proposal when it comes, and then I want to present a very

brief discussion of the major portions of a research proposal so we can all have a common frame of reference because after that I want to get into the most common errors that we are confronted with in the many proposals that are sent to us. And then, finally, I want to offer you some suggestions that I think would be helpful to you and to your college back home in preparing proposals and in dealing with a research funding agency, whether it be with the Office of Education or Ford Foundation or some other organization.

First of all, in the Office of Education, we have a Bureau of Research which supports three major types of research activities. We support individual project research, and these can be large projects all the way up to several hundred thousands of dollars, or they can be small projects which can go up to seven thousand dollars with the overhead and bring it up to around nine thousand dollars maximum. We support research on a wide range of topics. You just name it, and if it is related to education, we support it. The subjects of the research can be all the way from little preschoolers through graduate work, adult education, extension work, etc. We even had a project in training executives in innovated behavior because it was a training function, and we might have learned something in that research which might be passed on to our graduate schools of commerce and finance. We now are able under new legislation to support laboratories and to continue supporting research and development centers. The laboratories are going to be regional efforts and they bring together people in colleges and universities, public schools, state departments, professional organizations, and associations, profit and non-profit organizations to work on a wide range of topics in research and then to do demonstrations when they come up with something which is really a hot find and then to disseminate their findings.

The Research Development Centers are the responsibility of a single institution; they are large-scale things; they are programmatic research -- not individual projects -- but they, unlike the labs, do not, are not, concerned with a wide range of problems but rather a particular area. For example, one research development center at the University of Pittsburgh is dealing with individualized instruction at the public school level, program learning, etc. Another one at the University of Oregon is dealing with school and community relationships and so on. Now, under the new legislation, we are also going to be able to support this badly needed activity of training new researchers at the undergraduate level, graduate level, and the post-graduate level. This is long overdue because, believe me, in the behavioral sciences we have too few people who really know how to do research.

Now, let me give you some information about how research proposals are processed. We have no deadlines any more. We used to have three a year, but a proposal can come in anytime, and as soon as it comes in and

we have acknowledged receipt of it we put it into the review process. The first step is that it goes out to field readers; they evaluate it and send back their comments to us. Then the branch that would be responsible for monitoring this project, if it were to be approved, . . . has a seminar discussion of the proposal. We pass our recommendations on the basis of our comments and the field readers' comments onto the next group which is made up of the branch directors within the division that the first branch is associated with. Then, after their pow-wow, they send it on to an internal review committee which is made up of the division chiefs within the Bureau of Research and other appointed people before the recommendations are passed on to the Commissioner because, officially, he does the recommending. Anyone can apply now. It used to be only colleges and universities and public schools through their state departments and the state departments.

. . .The time it takes to process a proposal is approximately three months and the criteria we use are these four groups and their specific criteria with the needs. The educational significance of the problem, the research design (and this is the most important group of criteria), and the economic efficiency: what is the anticipated outcome as compared to the cost -- not the actual cost, and then the personnel facilities available for doing the research. How much do these people seem to know about this? How much experience have they had? Do they have the facilities at that institution to carry out the work? Our approval rate is only about twenty-seven per cent; this is not an established percentage -- this is just the way it has worked out over the years.

Now let me tell you very briefly about the four major sections of the proposal. There are other sections in the proposal, but these are the chief ones that we should be concerned about at a research conference. I am telling you these only because we will have a common frame of reference for that which is to follow: the common errors made in preparing the research proposals. The first section is the problem section; next, objective research; and then, procedures. Problems, objectives, related research, and procedures. Now I am going to tell you briefly what the general content of each of these sections ought to be, and then I am going to go into the most common errors. And I derived my knowledge of the common errors from having read hundreds of proposals that have been sent to me personally for preview and sent by people in the Office of Education who asked me to please review this for somebody out in the field and having sat in on panel discussions of hundreds of other proposals. . . . Incidentally, I suppose I should tell those of you who don't know, I am a psychologist.

Now, let's look at the problem section. In just one or two paragraphs, no more than that, a person should tell in general terms what the total context of the particular research problem is, not what he is going specifically to do but what is the setting for it, and then in a very few words what aspect of this larger problem. What part of this are you going to attack and why? And then a very broad general statement. For example, here is a person who says we are being confronted now with increasing enrollment in our colleges and universities -- the greater problem -- . . . I want to work on one aspect of that problem and this is why I think it is important to do this.

Then come the objectives. Here the person should state very specifically what the goals are, and these statements could be in the form of statements like "I am going to do this, this," or hypotheses or questions.

Then comes the related research section. The purpose of this section is to provide information that this individual is thoroughly familiar with all the pertinent research that is related to this problem. . . .You should be familiar with related research because you want to preclude repetition. . . And also we want you to look into related research so that you can see the gaps that are left by other studies. So this section should show the relationship between what the individual plans to do in his particular project and all the other work that has gone before. And so we would like for you to cite five or six real good closely related studies, and then in broad fashion summarize the other closely related studies. Now in looking for related studies you should check not only the traditional sources but also for those of you who have pencils, I think you ought to write this down (I am a good plugger for this organization): The Science Information Exchange, 1730 M Street NW, Washington. That organization keeps one-page descriptions of all projects that are currently in operation in the United States provided the investigator has informed them . . . .

Now, let's turn briefly to the procedures section. Here, in as few words as possible, this section should provide a step-by-step description of how the major aspects of the research will be carried out. And it should be written in such a fashion that any competent researcher could use it as a guide to carry out the research without having conceived the thing himself. And, so, <u>specifically</u>, and I underline this ten thousand times, <u>specifically</u> it should answer the questions specifically: what are you going to do? Specifically, how are you going to do it? To whom are you going to do it? Why are you going to do it? This is awfully important. I am going to repeat this later on. . . . why do you think this is a good thing to do, and how are you going to evaluate the outcome?

Specifically, what, how, to whom, why, and how you are going to evaluate. With these major sections of the proposal in mind: the problems, the objectives, the related research, and the procedures, let's look at some of the typical errors made in the proposals, and I'm not talking about errors made by the novice. I'm talking about errors made by relatively sophisticated people. Before I go into a specific detail about this, I want to point out three major strikes we have against us in guidance. First of all, the vast majority of people who are attracted to this field are service oriented, not research oriented; I didn't say there was anything wrong with this, but this is a fact. . . .Second strike against us is that the people in this field are so busy with the case work that they have that they don't have time to step out of line half-time, three-fourths time, one-fourth time, whatever it is, to do the research. . . . Our third big strike against us is that mentioned today in one of the presentations, that variables are out of this world, terribly complicated. Ladies and Gentlemen, these are practical problems which we can't ignore, and we are never going to get off the ground until we can somehow resolve these problems. . . .

Now, let us look at the errors that people typically make in preparing research proposals. The most common error made by proposers is that of selecting a problem that is entirely too big. Keep in mind that all research, whether it is physics, chemistry, mathematics, psychology, whatever it is, has one thing in common: it is an attempt to reduce the element of chance and if, through a research project, you have reduced the element of chance just a teensy-weensy bit, you have made a contribution. This error of trying to bite off too big a problem is one of the most tell-tale characteristics of the unsophisticated researcher. . . .

Another problem is selecting a problem that is out of sequence. Now I have already mentioned that today. This business of saying we've got to do research and training -- we don't know if we are training counselors properly, training teachers properly, training you-know-what properly, so let's do some research. And I say you don't start there. What are your performance criteria? What are you training the person to do? . . .

And then finally in this problem section -- that's what I'm talking about at the moment -- the very common error which shows up and seems like a minor one, but it can have an adverse effect on the evaluation of a proposal, is raising all sorts of rhetorical questions in that first section which the investigator has no intention of referring to later. Now I am accustomed to that because I have read hundreds of proposals, but

our reviewers don't read as many as I do and so they have the wrong mind set for that which is a follow-up and some don't come up to that. So they say the guy has missed the point -- well, I am accustomed to having people raise all sorts of rhetorical questions which they have no intention of following through on. This is wrong and shouldn't be done.

Okay, what do they do in the related research section? Well, the major error made in this section is made by those who treat the citing of related studies as though it were an academic exercise. All they do is list a whole bunch of studies that have been done and make a few comments about it and it is left up to the reviewer to decide how all these studies are related to the one that you are going to do. We don't want to do their homework for them. Now as I have already indicated, this section should be so presented that the reviewer would be convinced that the proposer is thoroughly familiar with the research that is closely related to his proposed project.

And, now, the objective section. Here the most common error is the corollary to the one that I have already mentioned in conjunction to the problem section; namely, planning to accomplish too much in one project. When I open up a proposal and I see a long list of objectives, I don't have to read the rest of the proposal because I know this guy isn't going to do any such thing. A project which only has several objectives is already too big. Another area in this section is listing objectives that are not at all, or at best only vaguely, related to the procedures that are subsequently described in the proposal. One sometimes gets the impression that proposer perceives the section the way a college freshman regards an outline, as busy work which you are supposed to ignore when you get around to the exposition. Another error is listing procedural steps as though they were objectives. For example, a person might say, "I'm going to interview a nundred teachers." . . . . These aren't objectives; these are procedural steps which lead to the objectives.

Now, let's focus our attention on the procedure section. The errors made here are legion, believe me, but for purposes of this presentation, I have tried to select those which are made both by the novice and the relatively sophisticated person. Here again, the most common error is a corollary to the one I have already referred to in the problems and objectives sections and that is ignoring uncontrollable variables primarily because the person has failed to recognize the magnitude of the problem. . . . .

Another weakness in the procedure section is making faulty decisions with regard to instruments such as tests, inventories, and rating scales. And I get a lot of this very common error. Here is a guy that wants to do an experimental something or other in a class. He wants to teach concepts and

things that the traditional approach hasn't been doing, and so he wants to evaluate the outcome, the experimental crowd against the control. And so he says, "I've looked around, and I couldn't find any instruments available which measure these new concepts which I am trying to gather, and so I'm going to develop an instrument." One sentence. . . .I go out and negotiate contracts, whole contracts, lasting sometimes two, sometimes three, years for the development of a single instrument. . . . .Now one of the reasons we don't have good instruments is that they are so very difficult to develop.

. . .Another thing that proposers do is to fail to describe little known instruments. They don't give us any psychometric data, whether there is any validity or reliability data, and we would like to know if this has been put to any kind of a test. He is really asking us to accept these on faith. Now, since the results of most of our research projects depend upon evaluation through instruments, this is a very important consideration. I succeeded in getting built into priority one thing -- as it was set up in the Office of Education -- and that was the development of instruments, and I really didn't think that they were going to buy. But every topic there, one of the subsections there, one of the topics there was always instrumentation, instrumentation, because we so badly needed work done in this area.

Another error is using labels to represent complex procedures involving an entire constellation of variables which are not identified individually. Just using a label. Such labels are really collapsed categories which conceal potent sources of variants. . . .

And still another error. And it's amazing how often this comes up. It really surprises me, and that is ignoring a possible Hawthorne effect. Now you think, surely by this time, that most of us would be pretty sensitive to that force running around, but apparently that doesn't seem to be the case. And it seems that people in the field of counseling are especially vulnerable here. I think it is because we like to think that what we are doing is making all the difference in the world in a person's life and all the other variables that are operating just aren't there. The very fact that we are doing something special could be tilted to balance just any old thing and not the particular thing that we happen to be doing.

Making errors in the selection of a sample is another thing that is often done which is wrong. The most common of these is not selecting samples that are large enough to allow for possible attrition; in other words, the loss of subjects for any of a number of reasons. If a person is going to do a longitudinal study, he's got to allow for the fact that some people are going to move away. . . . Another reason for the attrition is an unwillingness on the part of the subjects to continue participation, especially if their

participation requires a lot of effort or time on their part and you can't assume he is going to stick with you.

Another error in the sample business is selecting the sample on the basis of traditional categories which may be inappropriate for purposes of the research. . . .

Another error is underestimating the complexity of studies involving inquiry into the motivation for behavior. Motivation is a very complex phenomenon in this life, and some proposed projects, as I said this afternoon, would require a junior high school student, for example, to manifest the kind of insight into his behavior that not even the social scientist has into his behavior. And a questionnaire is rarely an adequate instrument for getting at motives for behavior. I've often written across questionnaires, "Sir, have you tried to answer these questions yourself?"

. . .Now they are making only vague references to or citing inappropriate statistical procedures. This is the bane of our existence, and this is the last area that I am going to mention -- procedure section. One sometimes gets the impression that the proposer, in preparing data in an analysis section, has copied selected terms that he found in the table of contents of some stat book somewhere, or he makes this other very common error by using the statement, "appropriate statistical techniques will be used." What are those? Boy, that's a nice statement. Now, as you well know, in most instances, the statistical analysis to be employed must be decided upon before you start picking up your data so that you will know in what form your data will appear. Now, this is one thing which I would like to stress very much with you. Unfortunately, many people feel defensive because they are not well schooled in statistics; this is nonsense. The statistician doesn't feel apologetic about not knowing economics or geography or history. Why should you feel apologetic if you don't know his field? And so one thing that I think we need to do is to recognize that this is the age of specialization. . . . And so what I would like for people in the field of guidance, as well as in other fields, to do is to have the real perceptive, well-informed practitioner who knows the problems team up with the methodologist -- not a guy who has had a couple of courses, but a guy who really knows methodology -- these two people as a team. . . and then have a guy who is well schooled in statistics come in . . . to take a look at the data and derive meaning and interpretation from it. But for one person to pretend that he is all three of these people is short of ridiculous.

Now my final section. I would like to offer you some suggestions which I feel might be of value to you and your colleagues in preparing research

proposals and also with dealing with research funding agencies. Now, by implication, by pointing out the common errors that are made in proposals, I've already offered you some suggestions, but I have a couple more here. Because the most common error made by proposers is selecting too large a problem, I want to offer my chief suggestion: that one should select a problem that is manageable. Now please keep this in mind, and I'd like for you to pass this analogy if you will, if you think it is worthwhile, and I hope you do, on to your colleagues. Keep in mind that we spent millions of dollars, hundreds of man years collectively, trying to understand the characteristics of that itsey bitsey micro-org nism, and I am using a superfluous modifier for effect, that itsey bitsey micro-organism causing poliomyelitis. Millions, hundreds of man years, trying merely to understand its characteristics. Basic research. . . .And here we are with these complex human organisms and, klunk, do we think that we are going to completely revolutionize an educational process with a sixty, eighty, hundred-twenty thousand dollar project?

Now we have people sitting on our review panels who say, "You know we have been doing a lot of research around here for eight years and we had better get this stuff out in schools." Listen. If the layman hears us talk like this, we are not going to get money very long because the layman very often has the purse strings, and he is a Congressman, etc. And he says, "Come to think of it, eight years seems to me time enough for you to have done a heck of a lot." We people who know what the problems are have got to be realistic about what is possible and we have got to help the layman to understand what he has a right to expect from a single project. And so if we are going to go on and pretend we are going to completely revolutionize an educational process with a skimpy hundred thousand dollars, what can you expect the layman to do? You may say you don't want to be bothered with this kind of thing, but we need to be bothered because it is our responsibility to help him understand what he has the right to expect. . . . The errors cannot be seen by the layman, but we need to help them understand.

Now because our problems in research involving human beings are so very complex, my second suggestion is this: that you give very careful consideration to collaborative research. I believe in the team approach. . . . I also would like to see more group approach, that is, have two or more groups at various schools, universities, what-have-you come together and pool their efforts so that we can have a collaborative attack on a problem. . . . Now I am not suggesting that a collaborative approach ought to replace discreet research; I'm not saying that. But rather it should supplement.

Third, when a project can be sub-divided into phases, it should be described in phases. Now very often what a person plans to do in subsequent phases is very contingent upon the success of the first phase. So, if a guy writes a project for the whole bit, if his first phase doesn't succeed, we don't have a project. . . .Now, when a person does put it in this phase business like I mentioned, he should in the problem section explain what he would like ultimately to do, but make it clear that in this proposal he's asking support for just this first phase. This will considerably enhance the possibility that he is going to get support. So any project that is going to extend over four years should be looked with a jaundiced eye to see whether it can be phased.

Fourth, when it is appropriate -- and more often than not it is appropriate -- one should be compulsive about considering all the variables which could conceivably directly affect the outcome of the proposed research. Now here compulsion is a virtue, believe me. . . . .

After one has the proposal written and he thinks it is ready to come in to us -- and this is a very simple suggestion, but if more people would do this, it would preclude a lot of disappointment in getting support for research -- he should show it to one or several of his colleagues whose judgment he respects but who have not been thinking about this particular problem. The reason I say this is that all of us are guilty of reading into a document that which just isn't there, and if a colleague doesn't understand something on page two, seven, or nine, we aren't going to understand it either. . . . so we need to be told. Not in great detail, but we need to be told.

Then the final suggestion: proposal preparation. I have already mentioned this, but you should state specifically what you are going to do, specifically how you are going to do it, to whom, why you are going to do it -- don't forget the rational -- and how you are going to evaluate the outcome.

Now, in closing, I would like to clarify a very common misunderstanding. Our reviewers are often criticized for disapproving a project because, quote, "They apparently don't recognize it as being an important problem." How many times I am told that over the telephone. I can't think of a problem in education that has been sufficiently researched. We are at the base line in educational research; we haven't even moved away from it. Of course, we ought to do something about improving teaching. Of course, we ought to do something about improving curriculum material. Of course, we ought to do something about our guidance procedures. Who can deny this? But will the proposed project contribute anything to the solution of the problem? . . .

I am often asked, "What topics are you pushing now in Cooperative Research?" . . . And my stock reply is, "Any well-designed research that is related to education."

Now, if we were to approve projects having serious methodological errors because we wish to be kind or to be generous, this would be misguided philanthropy. Such a procedure as this does not do a favor to educational research; in fact, it can do it damage because you could come up with erroneous results if people could pick up and start running with it. And you know how too common this is. So we could be doing damage to educational research; we certainly are not going to be doing the taxpayer a favor by wasting his money; and we are not doing a favor to a proposer by sending him down the wrong alley for a couple of years of his professional time which is very valuable. So this would be misguided philanthropy. . . In my business I am interested in all the problems that a specialist perceives as being a problem, and we don't stand as guards to the entrance to the storehouse of research money defying you to get past us -- that's not the role that we play. On the contrary, if yours is a legitimate problem for educational research, we, the staff in the Bureau of Research, want to do everything we possibly can to enhance the probability that you are going to get support for your research if it is good research. . . . .